1	IN THE UNITED STA	ATES DISTRICT COURT	
2	FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON		
3	PROJECT VERITAS and PROJECT)		
4	VERITAS ACTION FUND,) Plaintiffs,)	Case No. 3:20-cv-01435-MO	
5	v. Plaintills,)	Case No. 3:20-CV-01433-NO	
6	v. ,) MICHAEL SCHMIDT, in his)	October 7, 2020	
7	official capacity as Multnomah) County District Attorney, and)		
8 9	ELLEN ROSENBLUM, in her) official capacity as Oregon) Attorney General,)		
10	Defendants.	Portland, Oregon	
11)		
12			
13			
14			
15	Oral Argument		
16	(By Videoconference)		
17	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS		
18	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL W. MOSMAN		
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE		
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

Г	T		
1			
2	APPEARANCES		
3			
4	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	Mr. Benjamin Barr	
5		Attorney at Law 444 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1200	
6		Chicago, IL 60611	
7		Mr. Stephen Klein	
8		Barr & Klein PLLC 1629 K Street NW, Suite 300	
9		Washington, DC 20006	
10			
11	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	Mr. Brian Simmonds Marshall	
12		Ms. Shaunee Vanessa Morgan Oregon Department of Justice	
13		Trial Division 100 S.W. Market Street	
14		Portland, OR 97201	
15			
16			
17	COURT REPORTER:	Bonita J. Shumway, CSR, RMR, CRR	
18		United States District Courthouse 1000 S.W. Third Ave., Room 301	
19		Portland, OR 97204 (503) 326-8188	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 (PROCEEDINGS)2 (October 7, 2020; 9:08 a.m.) * * * * * 3 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: The United States District 4 5 Court for the District of Oregon is now in session, the 6 Honorable Michael Mosman presiding. 7 Your Honor, this is the time and place set for a preliminary injunction hearing in Case No. 3:20-cv-1435-JR, 8 9 Project Veritas, et al. versus Schmidt, et al. 10 Counsel, can you introduce yourself for the record. 11 MR. BARR: My name is Benjamin Barr on behalf of the 12 Project Veritas plaintiffs. 13 MR. MARSHALL: Your Honor, this is Brian Marshall on behalf of the state defendants. I am with Ms. Morgan. 14 15 THE COURT: Anyone else? 16 THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: It looks like Mr. Klein is no 17 longer on the video screen. 18 MR. BARR: Yes, Mr. Stephen Klein is also 19 representing Project Veritas plaintiffs, but I think he temporarily disconnected. 20 21 THE COURT: Do you need us to wait for him to be 22 reconnected to begin the hearing or not? MR. BARR: No, Your Honor. We're fine. 23 24 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 25 I have several issues here in front of me. I'm going

to present generally the issues in the sort of categories or buckets as I see them, and then take them up on the merits.

So I think of the case in terms of its statutory analysis as involving three different categories of statutory text. The first is the general ban on what I'll just call secret recordings, non-noticed, non-identified recordings where the recorder is a party to the conversations or events being recorded. And that's a general ban. It has exceptions, but as a general ban -- We just had someone join. Is that you, Mr. Klein?

MR. KLEIN: Yes, Your Honor. I'm sorry. I got kicked off the video, but I'll just join by phone.

THE COURT: That's fine. Thank you.

I'm looking at this case in four categories. The first three involve the statutory text and three sort of issues of statutory text to look at.

The first is the general ban on secret recordings.

And as a general ban, independent of its exceptions, it appears to me, generally speaking, to be not content based and subject therefore to intermediate scrutiny.

The second is the impact that an exception, not on so much the idea of totally secret recordings, but the exception to the notice requirement otherwise generally employed for what I'll call law enforcement encounters. What does that mean? How is that analyzed?

The plaintiff here argues that that exception for an otherwise -- the otherwise intact requirement to tell people you're recording them, an exception that requires open, not secret recording but doesn't require this notice feature is content based. And I'm not sure about that. The Ag-Gag case seems to me to be one way to think about it, but there are other cases suggesting sort of some -- some uncertainty as to how one frames the question. Is it framed as a question where there's a topic -- law enforcement, that's the subject of an exception, and others are not, and does that make it content based or not? Of course, if it is content based, then it's subjected to strict scrutiny. If it's not content based, then it's not.

Then the third statutory issue is very similar to the second, and that's the other exception for what I'll call open public settings. Still no secret recordings allowed, open recordings allowed, but no identification -- no notice required. And that's also suggested by plaintiffs to be content based. That's a tougher slip for plaintiffs than the law enforcement exception since the text of the statute doesn't seem to raise a particular topic, but I'll, of course, hear the parties out. If that tentative view is correct, then that would be subjected to intermediate scrutiny.

The last of the textual issues is this misdemeanor criminalization of innocent publishing. And, quite candidly,

if we get that far on a facial challenge, if a facial challenge by this plaintiff is appropriate to that statute, then that seems to run directly afoul of *Bartnicki* and be one that would be unconstitutional to be applied in the textual setting it raises.

On the publishers and on other issues, the state raises some challenges to this plaintiff which seem to me to be almost entirely beside the point, since this isn't, as best I have read plaintiffs' briefing, an as-applied challenge but a facial challenge. So those pages of text seem to me to be wasted.

The last issue is maybe the most important one -it's certainly the predicate issue here -- and that is is
equitable relief available here. And this is emergency
equitable relief. There are typically two -- one principal but
two reasons why equitable relief wouldn't be available in a
setting like this. One is we don't grant this emergency
unusual form of relief to plaintiffs who have known of the
issue and sat on their hands. And that's, of course, exactly
what defendant claims here, that perhaps for even a decade this
plaintiff has known of the problems raised for news-gathering
organizations in general and its own news-gathering
organization in particular, and done nothing about it to
challenge it, despite probably many obvious opportunities to do
work in Oregon that might run afoul of this statute.

So if that turns out to be correct, I think that's fatal to the plaintiff proceeding forward here. We don't grant relief to people who challenge statutes they've known about for a decade.

More recently, but still far enough back in time that we probably could have had a trial already by now, plaintiff has engaged in activity in Oregon that appears to at least run the issue of running afoul of the statute. A whole separate issue is raised by the fact that they've never been prosecuted for any of that, but more importantly for my purposes, it highlights the idea that plaintiff may not come to this Court in equity with clean hands seeking equitable relief on an emergency basis.

That's not to say it can't seek relief, it can't challenge the statute. Of course it can through normal regular means, but it can't -- a plaintiff can't come into federal court with its hair on fire over an emergency that it's known about for a long time.

So I'll start with plaintiff first with that first issue. The briefing suggests you've known about this statute for a long time, acted in Oregon in possible derogation of the statute for a long time, and now on, you know, a few days' notice want to come into court and get emergency relief.

Why isn't that barred to you, given your knowledge and past conduct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BARR: Yes, Your Honor. It takes tremendous resources for an organization to marshal a First Amendment challenge in federal court. Project Veritas and Project Veritas Action Fund has taken very apprehensively a few investigations in the past, being aware of the criminal violations applied to reporting news in this state. generally wanted to litigate here but hasn't had the funds or the availability to do so, and only as really a truly --Portland becoming an epicenter of national news and dramatic interest about violent protests that it decided that it wanted to make that a priority to be able to get in there, and it didn't want to face the criminal liability that's the parable of the Sword of Damocles hanging over news reporters' heads. The value is not that the sword drops but that it hangs and that at any time a prosecutor can sweep in and penalize the publication of truthful information here.

Veritas wants to act on a story of national interest; in particular, the protests that have occurred here. It's also been wanting to follow this story related to the public records advocate. It just had a second advocate resign last week. The story is very hot. And in that sort of instance, under the Winter standard in the Ninth Circuit, we analyze the three remaining factors besides the likelihood of success on the merits.

THE COURT: Let's not -- let's not get too far afield

here. My question isn't whether you're going to win on the merits. My question, first of all, is is it correct that you've known about the statute for a long time and its direct application to your work? The answer to that question seems to be yes, and your explanation for the sort of delay that would otherwise be fatal to your case is you didn't have enough money to file a lawsuit, right?

MR. BARR: Yes. The funding is of primary concern, and also simply the rise in prominence about Antifa. It's a story that Project Veritas and Action Fund have been following nationwide. We've submitted DVDs with the verified complaint showing how they worked in other states to track this story that was becoming prime and central in Portland, and decided that this was now becoming a real focal point where they wanted to operate. It wasn't as important before. It became suddenly important to follow up on these stories. They have a First Amendment right to engage in news gathering, and the law forbade it. And so with that sudden change in circumstances, they wanted to move forward.

THE COURT: Thank you.

For defendants, your response to the equitable argument?

MR. MARSHALL: Your Honor, we think that *Benisek* is quite on point to your -- the Supreme Court case where they have -- where the Supreme Court held that six years was too

long to seek a preliminary injunction at all, as opposed to not even on an emergency basis.

Exhibit 1 on page 74 is the defendant's (sic) testimony. Their CEO said that they contemplated looking at this, at suing on this statute in 2014. And so here we are six years later, not only knowing that they had knowingly violated the statute, recently posted videos that were apparently created in violation -- or recordings that were created in violation of the statute, and have been doing that on an ongoing basis.

So I don't know that we have a lot more to add, other than that *Benisek*, combined with Mr. O'Keefe's testimony, does seem to foreclose the availability of a preliminary injunction in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you very much.

Do you wish to make any reply for plaintiff?

MR. BARR: I think my simple response would be that the focus here is on the story and activity, the conduct that Veritas wanted to do. Antifa and its public prominence wasn't a thing ten years ago. That's not what Veritas was focusing on. It knew about the law, but it wasn't as important to move forward. As new stories become prominent and they have unknown geographical impact, that changes it. The Antifa stories are really of the past four years going forward, and most of the early focus there was in Virginia and some states in the south.

It's only been recently that Antifa has become a hotbed in Portland, and that is what has pushed them to move forward at this juncture, not ten years ago.

Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I think this is a classic case of the plaintiff being disentitled to seek equitable relief. The plaintiff has known about this statute and been concerned about the impact of the statute on its business for at least a decade. And it's not been an abstract concern. It has done its business under the umbrella of the statute's coverage quite likely here in Oregon in the past. It's not enough to say that now we're super interested, where before we were just aware. I mean, stories come and go. There's the Antifa story today, but the plaintiff had an interest, an expressed interest by its own CEO in challenging the statute at least six years ago. All of that is far, far beyond the time that would allow someone to come in and seek extraordinary injunctive relief on a preliminary basis in a court of equity.

As to the public records advocate, that's not remotely the sort of facts or case that would justify injunctive relief. There's really nothing the plaintiff wants to do in derogation of the statute that it couldn't do after a trial and a victory and accomplish largely the same results. It's not a -- it's not a hot story. There may be new events,

but the story is old. And so that one doesn't remotely qualify for injunctive relief.

But in any event, it's unusual to have a plaintiff come in interested and aware of the statute, having contemplated suing, by the admission of its own CEO, and seek rapid relief this way. So I deny on equitable grounds the motion for preliminary injunction.

That's not to say we don't need to resolve these issues. They are very important issues. And it well may be on one or more of these issues that plaintiff ultimately prevails. I think plaintiff has serious arguments. What it doesn't have is an emergency and is not entitled under its own behavior to injunctive relief.

I'll ask the parties to meet and submit a case management schedule for getting this case promptly to trial, through discovery and trial, and then you can outline not only your areas of agreement but your areas of disagreement.

Upon receipt of that joint case management proposal
-- "joint" meaning just that you both contribute to it, not
that you agree on everything -- I will hold a status conference
and set further deadlines in this case to reach the point of
dispositive motions and trial.

Thank you all. Good day.

THE COURTROOM DEPUTY: This court is adjourned.

(Proceedings concluded at 9:32 a.m.)

--000--I certify, by signing below, that the foregoing is a correct transcript of the record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause. A transcript without an original signature or conformed signature is not certified. /s/Bonita J. Shumway October 14, 2020 BONITA J. SHUMWAY, CSR, RMR, CRR DATE Official Court Reporter

Case 3:20-cv-01435-MC	2020 n 31 / 6 i 6/2 0/27/2	about 412 \$ 5/5 5/6
MR. BARR: [6]	13/9	6/23 7/3 7/18 7/20
3/10 3/17 3/22 7/25	3	8/10 9/3 9/9 10/21
9/7 10/16	300 [1] 2/8	11/8 11/8
MR. KLEIN: [1]	301 [1] 2/18	above [1] 13/6
4/10	326-8188 [1] 2/19	above-entitled [1]
MR.	3:20-cv-01435-MO	13/6
MARSHALL: [2]	[1] 1/4	abstract [1] 11/10 accomplish [1]
3/12 9/22	3:20-cv-1435-JR [1]	11/24
THE COURT: [8]	3/8	act [1] 8/17
3/14 3/20 3/23 4/12	4	acted [1] 7/21
8/24 9/19 10/14 11/4	444 [1] 2/5	ACTION [3] 1/3
THE		8/4 9/10
COURTROOM	5	activity [2] 7/7
DEPUTY: [3] 3/2	503 [1] 2/19	10/18
3/15 12/23	6	add [1] 10/11
_	60611 [1] 2/5	adjourned [1]
o0o [1] 13/2	7	12/24 admission [1] 12/5
/	74 [1] 10/3	advocate [3] 8/20
//s/Bonita [1] 13/9	8	8/20 11/20
1	8188 [1] 2/19	afield [1] 8/25
100 [1] 2/12	9	afoul [3] 6/3 6/25 7/8
100 [1] 2/13 1000 [1] 2/18	97201 [1] 2/13	after [1] 11/23
1200 [1] 2/18	97204 [1] 2/18	Ag [1] 5/5
14 [1] 13/9	9:08 [1] 3/2	Ag-Gag [1] 5/5
1629 [1] 2/8	9:32 [1] 12/25	ago [3] 10/20 11/3
2	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	11/16
20006 [1] 2/8	a.m [2] 3/2 12/25	agree [1] 12/20
2014 [1] 10/5	able [1] 8/11	agreement [1]

A Case 3:20-cv-01435-MC	876 cument 32 Filed 10/27/2	0 3/Aat e 15 of 25
agreement [1]	apprehensively [1]	barred [1] 7/24
12/17	8/4	Bartnicki [1] 6/3
al [2] 3/9 3/9	appropriate [1] 6/2	based [6] 4/19 5/5
all [5] 3/24 9/2 10/1	are [6] 5/6 5/10	5/11 5/11 5/12 5/19
11/16 12/23	6/15 10/5 10/23	basis [4] 7/13 10/2
	12/9	10/10 11/18
allow [1] 11/17	areas [2] 12/17	be [18]
allowed [2] 5/16	12/17	became [1] 9/15
5/17	argues [1] 5/1	become [2] 10/22
almost [1] 6/8	argument [2] 1/15	11/1
already [1] 7/6	9/22	becoming [3] 8/9
also [4] 3/18 5/18	arguments [1]	9/13 9/14
8/18 9/9	12/11	been [7] 7/9 8/19
am [1] 3/14	og [16]	9/10 10/9 11/1 11/8
Amendment [2] 8/2	as-applied [1] 6/9	11/10
9/17	ask [1] 12/14	before [3] 1/18 9/15
analysis [1] 4/4	Attorney [3] 1/7	11/13
analyze [1] 8/22	1/9 2/4	begin [1] 3/22
analyzed [1] 4/25	availability [2] 8/8	behalf [2] 3/11 3/14
answer [1] 9/4	10/12	behavior [1] 12/12
Antifa [5] 9/9 10/19	available [2] 6/14	being [3] 4/7 8/5
10/23 11/1 11/14	L 2	
any [4] 7/10 8/15	6/16 Avo [1] 2/19	11/6
10/16 12/3	Avenue [1] 2/5	below [1] 13/4
Anyone [1] 3/15	Avenue [1] 2/5	Benisek [2] 9/23
apparently [1] 10/7	aware [3] 8/5 11/13	
APPEARANCES	12/4	Benjamin [2] 2/4
[1] 2/2	В	3/11 bosida [1], 6/9
appears [2] 4/18	back [1] 7/5	beside [1] 6/8
7/7	ban [5] 4/5 4/8 4/9	besides [1] 8/23
application [1] 9/4	4/17 4/18	best [1] 6/8
applied [3] 6/4 6/9	Barr [3] 2/4 2/7	beyond [1] 11/17
	. ,	

certainly [1] 6/13 certified [1] 13/7 certify [1] 13/4 challenge [8] 6/1 conformed [1] 13/7 contemplated [2] D Damocles [1] 8/13 DATE [1] 13/10

D Case 3:20-cv-01435-MC		
day [1] 12/23	DISTRICT [7] 1/1	11/12
days' [1] 7/22	1/2 1/7 1/19 2/17	entirely [1] 6/8
DC [1] 2/8	3/4 3/5	entitled [2] 12/12
deadlines [1] 12/21	Division [1] 2/12	13/6
decade [3] 6/20 7/4	do [7] 3/21 6/24 8/8	
11/9	10/16 10/19 11/23	equitable [7] 6/14
decided [2] 8/10	11/23	6/15 6/16 7/12 9/21
9/13	does [3] 4/24 5/10	11/7 12/6
defendant [1] 6/20	10/12	equity [2] 7/12
defendant's [1]	doesn't [4] 5/4 5/20	11/19
10/3	12/1 12/11	et [2] 3/9 3/9
defendants [4] 1/10	doing [1] 10/9	even [2] 6/20 10/2
2/11 3/14 9/21	don't [4] 6/17 7/2	event [1] 12/3
	10/11 12/8	events [2] 4/7 11/25
delay [1] 9/5	done [2] 6/23 11/10	
deny [1] 12/6	dramatic [1] 8/9	12/20
Department [1] 2/12	drops [1] 8/14	exactly [1] 6/19
	DVDs [1] 9/11	exception [7] 4/21
derogation [2] 7/21		4/22 5/1 5/3 5/10
11/23	<u>E</u>	5/15 5/20
despite [1] 6/24	early [1] 10/25	exceptions [2] 4/8
didn't [2] 8/12 9/6	ELLEN [1] 1/8	4/18
different [1] 4/4	else [1] 3/15	Exhibit [1] 10/3
direct [1] 9/3	emergency [7] 6/14	Exhibit 1 [1] 10/3
directly [1] 6/3	6/17 7/13 7/17 7/23	explanation [1] 9/5
disagreement [1]	10/2 12/12	expressed [1] 11/15
12/17	employed [1] 4/23	extraordinary [1]
disconnected [1]	encounters [1] 4/24	11/18
3/20	enforcement [3]	
discovery [1] 12/16	4/24 5/9 5/20	$ \mathbf{F} $
disentitled [1] 11/7	engage [1] 9/17	face [1] 8/12
dispositive [1]	engaged [1] 7/7	facial [3] 6/1 6/1

H Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO instance

Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO mpod fren 3/25F4/d 90/27/204/Hate 20 of 25 5/6 6/7 6/10 Mr. O'Keefe's [1] lawsuit [1] 9/7 mean [2] 4/24 10/12 least [3] 7/7 11/9 11/13 Mr. Stephen [1] 11/16 meaning [1] 12/19 3/18 let's [2] 8/25 8/25 means [1] 7/16 Ms [1] 2/11 **liability** [1] 8/12 meet [1] 12/14 Ms. [1] 3/14 like [2] 3/16 6/17 merits [3] 4/2 8/24 Ms. Morgan [1] likelihood [1] 8/23 3/14 9/2 likely [1] 11/11 **MICHAEL [3] 1/6** much [2] 4/22 litigate [1] 8/7 1/18 3/6 10/15 long [5] 7/18 7/21 **Michigan** [1] 2/5 Multnomah [1] 1/7 7/22 9/3 10/1 might [1] 6/25 my [5] 3/11 7/10 longer [1] 3/17 9/1 9/2 10/17 misdemeanor [1] look [1] 4/16 5/24 N looking [2] 4/14 MO [1] 1/4 10/4 name [1] 3/11 money [1] 9/6 looks [1] 3/16 national [2] 8/9 more [4] 7/5 7/10 lot [1] 10/11 8/17 10/11 12/10 nationwide [1] 9/11 M Morgan [2] 2/11 need [2] 3/21 12/8 make [3] 5/10 8/11 3/14 MOSMAN [2] 1/18 never [1] 7/9 10/16 new [2] 10/22 11/25 management [2] 3/6 news [6] 6/21 6/22 12/15 12/18 most [2] 6/12 10/24 8/6 8/9 8/13 9/17 many [1] 6/24 motion [1] 12/7 news-gathering [2] motions [1] 12/22 Market [1] 2/13 6/21 6/22 move [3] 9/19 10/21 marshal [1] 8/2 Ninth [1] 8/22 **Marshall** [2] 2/11 11/2 no [7] 1/4 3/8 3/16 3/13 Mr [3] 2/4 2/7 2/11 3/23 5/16 5/17 5/17 may [3] 7/11 11/25 Mr. [4] 3/16 3/18 non [2] 4/6 4/6 12/9 4/10 10/12 non-identified [1] Mr. Klein [2] 3/16 maybe [1] 6/12 4/6

N	Case 3:20-cv-01435-M
	-noticed [1] 4/6
	mal [1] 7/15
	[28]
11/	hing [2] 6/23
	ice [4] 4/23 5/4
	7 7/23
not	iced [1] 4/6
nov	v [5] 3/5 7/6
7/2	2 9/14 11/12
NW	[1] 2/8

O'Keefe's [1] 10/12 o0o [1] 13/2 obvious [1] 6/24 occurred [1] 8/18 October [3] 1/6 3/2 13/9 off [1] 4/12 official [3] 1/7 1/8 13/11 old [1] 12/1 one [8] 5/6 5/8 6/3 6/12 6/15 6/17 12/1 12/10 ongoing [1] 10/10 only [4] 8/8 10/6 11/1 12/16 open [3] 5/3 5/15 5/16

Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO operante 1 1 19/150/27/2 op a stg 41 of 42 5 8/5 opportunities [1] 6/24 opposed [1] 10/1 Oral [1] 1/15 **OREGON** [9] 1/2 1/8 1/10 2/12 3/5 6/25 7/7 7/21 11/11 organization [2] 6/23 8/2 organizations [1] 6/22 original [1] 13/6 other [5] 5/7 5/15 6/6 9/12 10/11 others [1] 5/10 otherwise [4] **4/23** 5/2 5/2 9/6 out [2] 5/22 7/1 outline [1] 12/16 over [2] 7/17 8/13 own [4] 6/22 11/15 12/5 12/12

P

page [1] 10/3 pages [1] 6/10 parable [1] 8/12 particular [3] 5/21 6/23 8/18 parties [2] 5/22 12/14 party [1] 4/7

10/24 11/12 penalize [1] **8/15** people [2] 5/2 7/3 perhaps [1] 6/20 phone [1] 4/12 place [1] 3/7 plaintiff [17] plaintiffs [7] 1/4 2/4 3/12 3/19 5/18 5/19 6/18 plaintiffs' [1] 6/9 PLLC [1] 2/7 point [4] 6/8 9/14 9/24 12/21 **Portland** [6] 1/10 2/13 2/18 8/9 9/13 11/2 possible [1] 7/21 posted [1] 10/7 predicate [1] 6/13 preliminary [5] 3/8 10/1 10/13 11/18 12/7 **present** [1] 4/1 presiding [1] 3/6 prevails [1] 12/10 primary [1] 9/8 prime [1] 9/13 **principal** [1] 6/15 **priority** [1] 8/11 **probably [2] 6/24**

P	Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO
pro	obably [1] 7/6
pro	oblems [1] 6/21
pro	oceeding [1] 7/2
pro	oceedings [3]
1/1	17 12/25 13/5
PR	OJECT [8] 1/3
1/3	3 3/9 3/12 3/19
8/3	3 8/3 9/10
pro	ominence [2] 9/9
1-	/19
pro	ominent [1]
10	/22
pro	omptly [1] 12/15
	oposal [1] 12/18
pro	osecuted [1] 7/9
pro	osecutor [1] 8/15
pro	otests [2] 8/10
8/1	18
pul	blic [4] 5/16 8/19
10	/ 19 11/20
pul	blication [1]
8/1	16
pul	blishers [1] 6/6
pul	blishing [1] $ 5/25 _{ m j}$
-	rposes [1] 7/10
pus	shed [1] 11/2
Q]
qua	alify [1] 12/1
_	estion [5] 5/8 5/8
	1 9/2 9/4

quitement 325/256942472 remaining 5[1] 8/23 11/11 R raise [1] 5/21 raised [2] 6/21 7/9 raises [2] 6/5 6/7 rapid [1] 12/6 reach [1] 12/21 read [1] 6/9 real [1] 9/14 really [3] 8/8 10/24 11/22 reasons [1] 6/16 receipt [1] 12/18 recently [3] 7/5 10/7 11/1 reconnected [1] 3/22 record [2] 3/10 13/5 recorded [1] 4/8 recorder [1] **4/7** recording [2] 5/3 5/4 recordings [7] 4/6 4/6 4/17 4/22 5/16 5/17 10/8 records [2] 8/19 11/20 regular [1] 7/15 related [1] 8/19 relief [14]

remotely [2] 11/21 12/1 reply [1] 10/16 REPORTER [2] 2/17 13/11 reporters' [1] 8/13 reporting [1] 8/6 representing [1] 3/19 **require** [1] 5/4 required [1] 5/18 requirement [2] 4/23 5/2 requires [1] 5/3 resign [1] 8/20 resolve [1] 12/8 resources [1] 8/2 response [2] 9/21 10/17 results [1] 11/24 right [3] 3/24 9/7 9/17 rise [1] 9/9 RMR [2] 2/17 13/10 Room [1] 2/18 **ROSENBLUM** [1] 1/8 run [3] 6/3 6/25 7/7 running [1] 7/8

Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO showing 321 Fig/112/27/2 states 256 f 21/1 1/19 2/17 3/4 9/12 10/25 **Shumway [3] 2/17** said [1] 10/4 status [1] 12/20 13/9 13/10 same [1] 11/24 sic [1] 10/3 statute [16] sat [1] 6/19 signature [2] 13/7 statute's [1] 11/11 say [3] 7/14 11/12 **statutes** [1] 7/3 13/7 12/8 signing [1] 13/4 **statutory** [5] 4/3 schedule [1] 12/15 similar [1] 5/14 4/4 4/15 4/16 5/14 **SCHMIDT [2] 1/6 Simmonds** [1] **2/11 Stephen [2] 2/7** 3/9 simple [1] 10/17 3/18 screen [1] 3/17 simply [1] 9/9 still [2] 5/16 7/5 scrutiny [3] 4/20 since [2] 5/20 6/8 stories [4] 9/16 5/12 5/23 six [3] 9/25 10/5 10/22 10/23 11/13 second [3] 4/21 story [9] 8/17 8/19 11/16 5/15 8/20 slip [1] 5/19 8/21 9/10 9/12 secret [5] 4/6 4/17 so [11] 4/3 4/21 10/18 11/14 11/25 4/22 5/4 5/16 6/10 7/1 7/19 8/8 12/1 see [1] 4/2 Street [2] 2/8 2/13 9/18 10/5 10/11 seek [5] 7/14 10/1 strict [1] 5/12 12/1 12/6 11/7 11/18 12/5 some [4] 5/7 5/7 6/7 subject [2] 4/19 5/9 seeking [1] 7/12 **subjected** [2] 5/12 10/25 seem [4] 5/21 6/7 someone [2] 4/9 5/23 6/10 10/13 submit [1] 12/14 11/17 seems [3] 5/6 6/3 **submitted** [1] 9/11 sorry [1] 4/11 9/4 sort [6] 4/1 4/15 5/7 success [1] 8/23 **separate** [1] 7/8 sudden [1] 9/18 8/21 9/5 11/21 serious [1] 12/11 south [1] 10/25 **suddenly** [1] 9/15 session [1] **3/5** speaking [1] 4/19 suggested [1] 5/18 set [2] 3/7 12/21 standard [1] 8/22 suggesting [1] 5/7 setting [2] 6/4 6/17 start [1] 7/19 **suggests** [1] 7/20 settings [1] 5/16 state [3] 3/14 6/6 suing [2] 10/5 12/5 several [1] 3/25 8/6 Suite [2] 2/5 2/8 **Shaunee** [1] 2/11

S	there's [3] 5/9 11/14 11/22 therefore [1] 4/20 these [3] 9/16 12/8 12/10 they [9] 9/12 9/14 9/16 9/19 9/24 10/4 10/6 10/22 12/9 they've [2] 7/3 7/9 thing [1] 10/20 think [8] 3/19 4/3 5/6 7/1 9/23 10/17 11/6 12/11 third [2] 2/18 5/14 this [29]	
---	--	--

Case 3:20-cv-01435-MO wappunge 232 8/16/1 10/27/20winge 25 9/15 U 11/22 us [1] 3/21 was [5] 9/13 9/14 V 9/25 10/20 10/25 value [1] 8/14 wasn't [3] 9/15 Vanessa [1] 2/11 verified [1] 9/11 10/19 10/21 **VERITAS** [11] 1/3 wasted [1] 6/11 1/3 3/9 3/12 3/19 way [2] 5/6 12/6 8/3 8/4 8/17 9/10 10/19 10/20 7/2 7/6 8/22 9/23 versus [1] 3/9 10/5 10/11 11/13 very [5] 5/14 8/4 12/8 8/21 10/15 12/9 we're [2] 3/23 victory [1] 11/24 11/12 video [2] 3/17 4/12 We've [1] 9/11 Videoconference week [1] 8/20 [1] 1/16 well [1] 12/9 videos [1] 10/7 were [3] 10/7 10/8 view [1] 5/22 11/13 **violated** [1] 10/6 what [8] 4/5 4/23 **violation** [2] 10/8 4/24 5/15 6/20 10/20 11/2 12/11 10/9 violations [1] 8/6 where [6] 4/6 5/8 violent [1] 8/10 9/14 9/24 9/25 Virginia [1] 10/25 11/13 whether [1] **9/1** W which [1] 6/7 wait [1] 3/21 who [2] 6/18 7/3 want [2] 7/23 8/12 whole [1] 7/8 wanted [5] 8/7 8/10 why [2] 6/16 7/24 9/14 9/19 10/19 will [1] 12/20

wanting [1] 8/19

Winter [1] 8/22 wish [1] 10/16 without [1] 13/6 Washington [1] 2/8 work [2] 6/25 9/4 worked [1] 9/12 would [6] 5/23 6/3 9/5 10/17 11/17 11/21 we [11] 4/9 6/1 6/17 wouldn't [1] 6/16

Y

years [6] 9/25 10/6 10/20 10/24 11/3 11/16 yes [5] 3/18 4/11 8/1 9/5 9/8 you [17] you're [2] 5/3 9/1 you've [2] 7/20 9/3 your [15] yourself [1] 3/10